

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_118284</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Review of Lifting Path Planning Algorithms for Intelligent Cranes</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Method Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript contributes valuable insights and knowledge that can drive future research and technological developments in the field of intelligent cranes and related areas.</p> <p>The title is concise, informative, and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript, making it suitable for the intended audience.</p> <p>The abstract does not provide any specific findings or conclusions from the review. It mentions that various algorithms are analyzed and summarized but does not detail any key insights or results from these analyses. The abstract mentions that various algorithms are analyzed and summarized but lacks clarity on the specific methods or criteria used for this analysis. it lacks a clear statement of the purpose or significance of the review in advancing the field.</p> <p>Each subsection tends to discuss algorithms in isolation without adequate comparison. Kindly Incorporate a comparative analysis within each section to help readers understand the relative strengths and weaknesses of the algorithms.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks visual aids such as tables or diagrams that could help summarize key points and enhance readability Use tables, diagrams, or flowcharts to summarize the algorithms, their features, and their performance metrics. This will make the content more accessible and easier to understand.</p> <p>There is little discussion on the potential for integrating different algorithms to enhance performance.</p> <p>By addressing these issues, the manuscript can provide a more thorough, comparative, and practical overview of lifting path planning algorithms for intelligent cranes. This will enhance its value to the scientific community and make it a more informative and useful resource.</p> <p>The manuscript is on the right track but requires significant improvements to ensure scientific correctness. These improvements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing more detailed explanations and mathematical formulations.</li> <li>• Updating the literature review with recent advancements.</li> <li>• Conducting a thorough critical analysis and comparative evaluation of the algorithms.</li> <li>• Including empirical evidence to support the theoretical discussions.</li> </ul> <p>References are ok.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Good</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript has the potential to be a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners in the field of intelligent cranes. However, to reach its full potential, it needs to be revised with a focus on providing detailed explanations, critical analysis, comparative evaluations, and empirical evidence. By addressing these areas, the paper can significantly enhance its scientific contribution and provide a more comprehensive and insightful review of lifting path planning algorithms for intelligent cranes.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shitsukane Shisiali Aggrey</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Technical University of Mombasa, Kenya</b>